Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities 4(3)(2025) 2070-2094

Research in Management and Humanities

DWIJMH VOL. 4 NO. 3 (2025) ISSN: 2980-4817

Available online at www.dwijmh.org
Journal homepage: http://www.dwijmh.org
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6884-3504

Can the proper employee treatment enhance employees' organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior?

Damianus Abun: Professor, Graduate School Business and Management, Divine Word College of Laoag.
Eldefonso B. Natividad: Education Program Supervisor, DepEd, School Division of Batac, Batac City, Ilocos Norte
Jyeza Mea T. Ullero: Instructor, School of Arts, Sciences, and Education, Divine Word College of Laoag.
Leighdy Shane P. Sison: Instructor, School of Arts, Sciences, and Education, Divine Word College of Laoag
Czarmae M. Andres: Instructor: School of Arts, Science,s and Education, Divine Word College of Laoag
Judy Ann P. Duyao: Instructor, School of Arts, Sciences, and Education, Divine Word College of Laoag.

ARTICLEINFO

Article history:
Received: June 07, 2025
Received in rev. form. July 30, 2025
Accepted: August 15, 2025
Published: September 10, 2025

Keywords: ***Employee treatment, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, workers' rights, normative commitment.***

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to examine the influence of employee treatment on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. To deepen the concept of the study, literatures were reviewed. The study used a descriptive assessment and correlational research design. The population of the study was the employees of the Divine Word College of Laoag. The study used research questionnaires to gather the data, and descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The study found no correlation between employee treatment and organizational commitment or organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, the hypothesis is rejected. The study recommends further study to include more organizational factors that might affect organizational commitment.

© 2025 by the authors. Licensee DWIJMH. This open-access article is distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/)

JEL Classification: M54

Introduction

The organizational environment always influences employees' behavior, and one of the key dimensions of this environment is organizational culture. Organizational culture can affect human behavior, whether it is positive or negative, as Cooley (2016) argued that an employee is not a cog in a machine but an individual who responds to their environment. This argument

* *Corresponding author. ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6884-3504*
© 2025 by the authors. Hosting by DWIJMH. Peer review under responsibility of Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities.

has been supported by studies demonstrating that a positive organizational culture can influence employees' behavior, including loyalty, efficiency, and organizational citizenship behavior (Pallathadka, 2021; Praveena & Fonceca, 2023; Putri et al., 2021). The same is true with a negative organizational culture. Negative culture is described as a mismatch between employees' and employers' values and is also marked by a lack of support from leadership and poor communication. Such a negative culture affects employees' behavior negatively (Fridan & Maamari, 2023). Thus, the management needs to manage the organizational culture well. One of the dimensions of organizational culture is employee treatment, which explains how the organization treats its employees, specifically respecting employees' rights and the employee-employer relationship. Abun et al. (2021) have pointed out that employee treatment influences the work engagement of employees.

Managing an organization nowadays requires attention not only to the knowledge and skills of employees, but also to the management's ability to treat their employees effectively. The reason is very fundamental, and it is because employees are human beings. Human beings have dignity, and attached to it are rights. Thus, respecting employees is a moral obligation. Treating employees as human beings with dignity can boost their morale and change their work behavior. Abun et al. (2020) pointed out that caring relationships in the workplace can reduce turnover, increase job satisfaction, and performance.

Studies concerning the effect of employee treatment on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior are not available. The current study aims to fill a gap, and it is expected that the results will help management recognize employee treatment as a crucial factor in promoting organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. OC and OCB are essential factors in improving organizational performance. Organizational commitment enables employees to fulfill their responsibilities with motivation, leading to the attainment of organizational objectives (Imamoglu et al., 2019). The same is true with organizational citizenship behavior, which also affects employees' performance positively (Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 2009).

The study is divided into several parts, which are the introduction, literature review, research methodology, data presentation and analysis, results, discussion, and conclusion.

Literature review

Under the literature review, the study reviews the existing literature concerning employee treatment, specifically employees' rights, respect in the workplace, workplace relationships, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior.

Employee treatment

Under employee treatment, three key topics require discussion: employee treatment according to the Labor Code of the Philippines, respect in the workplace, and the fostering of a caring relationship in the workplace.

The employee treatment under the labor code of the Philippines in terms of workers' rights

The concept of treatment in the workplace refers to the manner in which one individual behaves toward another. The Cambridge Dictionary defines treatment as "the way you deal with or behave toward someone or something," while the Collins Dictionary similarly describes it as "the manner of handling or dealing with a person or a thing." These seemingly simple definitions carry significant implications when applied to employment contexts, where treatment reflects not only interpersonal interactions but also organizational policies that shape the experiences of workers. Within schools, for example, treatment is manifested in the ways administrators and school leaders engage with teachers and staff, both in day-to-day practices and in broader management systems.

In the Philippines, workplace treatment is not left to discretion alone but is firmly grounded in law. The Labor Code of the Philippines provides the framework that governs employer–employee relations, enforced through the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE). The Labor Code serves as a guiding structure, balancing management prerogatives—the authority to hire, promote, discipline, and establish workplace rules—with the protection of workers' rights. While employers are

vested with legitimate authority to ensure organizational efficiency, the exercise of this power is never absolute; it must always be consistent with the rights and dignity guaranteed to employees.

This balance is deeply rooted in the 1987 Philippine Constitution, which upholds principles of human rights and social justice (GOVPH, 1987). In line with these constitutional guarantees, the Labor Code outlines mechanisms such as the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), which provides a formal platform for negotiation between employers and employees. Through collective bargaining, workplace conflicts are addressed constructively, enabling both parties to find mutually beneficial solutions (Jimenez, n.d.).

The rights of workers under the Labor Code encompass multiple dimensions of employment, each underscoring a different aspect of humane and equitable treatment. One fundamental right is security of tenure, which ensures that employees cannot be dismissed arbitrarily. Termination is only permitted for just or authorized causes and must strictly observe due process. Article 294 of the Labor Code clearly provides that an employee "shall not be terminated except for just cause or when authorized by law," thereby protecting workers against unjust dismissal (Jimenez, 2002; Calayag, 2018).

Equally important is the right to self-organization, which allows employees to form, join, or assist labor unions. This right was first institutionalized through Republic Act No. 875, the Industrial Peace Act of 1953, which recognized the need for collective action in safeguarding worker welfare (Republic of the Philippines, 1953). Closely linked to this is the right to collective bargaining, which empowers employees to negotiate with employers regarding wages, benefits, and working conditions. Together, these rights foster a more balanced power dynamic in labor relations (Jimenez, n.d.; 2002).

The right to humane working conditions is another cornerstone of labor protection. This right extends beyond physical safety, encompassing fair wages, reasonable working hours, and access to essential benefits. DOLE sets labor standards covering minimum wage, overtime pay, holiday pay, service incentive leave, and maternity and paternity leave, while also ensuring workers' access to social protections such as SSS, PhilHealth, Pag-IBIG, and employee compensation benefits (Jimenez, 2002; Busto, 2013). These safeguards collectively uphold the dignity of workers by preventing exploitation and ensuring decent working conditions.

The Labor Code and the Constitution also recognize the right to strike, granting workers the power to assert their demands through concerted action when negotiations fail. Alongside this, the right to participate in decision-making ensures that employees are not excluded from organizational matters directly affecting their welfare and working conditions (Jimenez, n.d.; Busto, 2013).

In addition, workers are guaranteed the right to a living wage, one that corresponds to the prevailing cost of living in their locality, as well as the right to a just share in the fruits of production, especially when increased productivity is attributable to employee contributions. The principle of equal employment opportunities further prohibits discrimination in hiring, promotion, and other aspects of work (Jimenez, n.d.; Busto, 2013).

Taken together, these legal provisions highlight that treatment in the workplace extends beyond courtesy or day-to-day interactions. It is fundamentally about fairness in systems, policies, and opportunities. As Lind and Tyler (1988) and Hassan (2012) emphasize, fair treatment has profound effects on both employee morale and organizational outcomes. Workers who perceive fairness in their workplace demonstrate higher trust in management, greater job satisfaction, and stronger commitment to their roles. Empirical evidence also suggests that fairness fosters intrinsic motivation and reduces turnover, as supported by the studies of Choi (2011), Kim and Rubyanti (2011), and Rubin (2011), all cited in Hassan (2012).

In essence, fair treatment in the workplace, as guided by the Constitution and the Labor Code of the Philippines, rests on the principle of balancing organizational authority with human dignity. Employers may exercise their management prerogatives, but such authority is circumscribed by law and ethics. Employees, on the other hand, are recognized not merely as labor inputs but as individuals entitled to rights and respect. By upholding this balance, organizations not only comply with legal requirements but also create healthier, more productive, and more humane working environments.

Respect in the workplace

Respect is often one of the earliest values taught in the family. From childhood, individuals are instructed to honor all people regardless of background, as well as to extend respect to all living and non-living entities, including the natural environment. Respect toward animals, for instance, rests on the recognition that they are capable of experiencing both pleasure and pain (Singer, 1974, as cited in Cochrane, n.d.). This principle underscores that sentient beings should not merely be protected for their usefulness to humans but because they inherently possess moral worth. Regan (1983), as cited in Cochrane (n.d.), emphasized that any being that is a "subject of a life" has inherent value, regardless of its suitability or utility for human purposes.

Respect is initially framed in human relations, forming the core of moral obligations. In this regard, Immanuel Kant positions respect as a categorical imperative—a moral law binding upon all rational beings. According to Kant, every individual has an ethical duty to respect others, and failure to do so constitutes an immoral act (Ross, 2009). This imperative does not stem merely from abstract moral law but is rooted in the principle of humanity. As Johnson (2016) explains, humanity is defined by rational capacities and the ability to pursue one's own ends. Consequently, individuals must never be treated solely as means to an end but always as ends in themselves. While this principle does not prohibit professional or social relationships where individuals serve mutual purposes, it rejects exploitative practices that reduce people to objects of utility. Thus, humans, as rational beings with dignity, must be regarded with respect (Johnson, 2016; Dillon, 2018).

This notion of respect aligns with Catholic social teaching, which places human dignity at the heart of its doctrine. The Catholic Church teaches that every human being has inherent dignity, being created in the image and likeness of God, and that such dignity is universal and inviolable—independent of race, gender, age, religion, ability, or social standing (Caritas Australia, n.d.). Consequently, no human dignity should be diminished or compromised. Rooted in this principle, the Church advocates for social actions aimed at restoring and protecting human dignity through integral human development initiatives (Development & Peace, 2000). Respect, therefore, is not merely a voluntary choice but a moral responsibility and categorical obligation. The Church respects and promotes dignity not as a matter of preference but because it is compelled to do so by its very ethical foundation.

The role of respect has also been studied within organizational and workplace contexts, particularly in relation to job satisfaction. Edery (2017) found that respect in human service organizations strongly predicts employee job satisfaction. Similarly, Gurchiek (2016) reported that employees identify respectful treatment at all organizational levels as a major determinant of workplace fulfillment. Ghaffari and Burgoyne (2017) confirmed these findings, demonstrating that respect toward employees is directly correlated with job satisfaction. Boafo (2018) further highlighted that perceived respect—and the absence of verbal abuse—serve as significant predictors of employee satisfaction. Respect also intersects with issues of equity in the workplace. Brooks (2018), in a comparative study of abled and disabled employees, discovered that workers with disabilities often received less respect, negatively influencing their job satisfaction. As a result, Brooks recommended disability awareness programs to enhance respect and inclusivity within organizational environments.

Taken together, philosophical, theological, and empirical perspectives converge to affirm that respect is not optional but an imperative. It is simultaneously a moral law, a religious mandate, and a practical necessity for social and organizational harmony. Whether directed toward people, animals, or communities, respect serves as the foundation for dignity, equity, and well-being.

Caring relationships in the workplace

The philosophical and moral basis of caring relationships in the workplace can be traced to the ethics of care, a framework first developed by Noddings (1984). This ethical theory emphasizes that moral actions should not be grounded merely in rules or abstract principles, but in the reality of interpersonal relationships (Staudt, 2016). At its core, the ethics of care insists that decisions and actions ought to be guided by caring. Originally articulated within the field of education, it has since been extended to multiple domains of life—including family, community, and the workplace—demonstrating that caring is the moral foundation of human relationships. For Noddings (1984), the teacher–student relationship embodies this principle: the teacher, as the carer, attends to the needs of the student, the cared-for. Later applications showed that this relational ethic

could serve as a guiding principle for decision-making in any context where one party holds responsibility for the well-being of another (Smith, 2020).

Noddings (2002, as cited by Smith, 2020) further explained that caring is not an optional virtue but a necessity of human life. Every person desires to be cared for, and authentic relationships are sustained by this mutual recognition. Central to caring is sympathy—a quality Burton (2015) described as a feeling of concern and care for another, coupled with the desire to see them better off. In such a relationship, the carer enters into the experience of the cared-for, responding with receptivity and openness. Listening becomes essential; only when the carer genuinely hears and responds can the cared-for truly experience being cared for (Smith, 2020).

When applied to workplace settings, this framework positions the manager as the carer and the employee as the cared-for. In this context, decision-making should be rooted in compassion, empathy, and concern for employee well-being. Effective leaders extend more than authority; they demonstrate attentiveness to the needs of their teams, provide meaningful support, and embody sympathy in ways that help employees flourish. This perspective is supported by Eldor and Shoshani's (2016) study, which found that compassion shown by principals and colleagues significantly enhanced teachers' work engagement, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. Similarly, Houston (2020), drawing from Moynihan and Pandey (2008) and Hodson (2004), argued that positive interpersonal interactions within the workplace foster employee satisfaction and reduce turnover rates.

Research further confirms the benefits of caring relationships. Tran et al. (2018) demonstrated that high-quality workplace relationships improve job performance, strengthen commitment, and lower stress levels. Barsade and O'Neill (2014) also provided evidence that employees who feel "loved" at work not only perform better but also contribute more positively to the organization. These findings align with Rosanne's (2014) argument that relationship-based care offers a sustainable and effective model for organizations of all types. As Brenner (2017) emphasized, caring leadership is marked by generosity—leaders invest time, energy, and effort to connect with and uplift employees.

The Mental Health Foundation (2016) added that caring relationships at work bring concrete benefits: greater job satisfaction, reduced turnover, and more positive and productive organizational cultures. Such environments not only promote efficiency but also safeguard mental health, reducing absenteeism and creating space for employees to thrive. In this way, both management and colleagues share responsibility for looking after one another—intervening when someone struggles, offering guidance, and fostering a workplace built on genuine care.

Organizational commitment

The concept of commitment, and more specifically organizational commitment, has been defined in multiple ways across literature. Even within dictionaries, definitions vary in nuance. For instance, the *Cambridge Dictionary* (n.d.) defines commitment as the "willingness to give your time and energy to a job, activity, or something that you believe in," while *Dictionary.com* (n.d.), derived from Oxford Languages, frames it as "the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, or an engagement or obligation that restricts freedom of action." Both definitions emphasize dedication and investment of time and energy, suggesting that commitment requires personal devotion to a task or belief. Similarly, the *Britannica Dictionary* defines commitment as "a promise to do or give something or a promise to be loyal to someone or something," reinforcing its association with loyalty and perseverance.

While these dictionary definitions provide a useful starting point, they often lack the psychological depth necessary to fully explain why individuals remain bound to their roles and institutions. Scholarly perspectives, by contrast, extend the discussion by incorporating emotional and cognitive dimensions. Leonard (2009), for example, describes commitment as "a state of mind that holds people and organizations in line with behaviour," emphasizing its psychological nature. According to this view, commitment transcends mere time and energy investment; it reflects a psychological contract between an individual and the institution, often rooted in emotional attachment. Similarly, Ajayi and Muraina (2016) highlight identification, defining commitment as "the extent to which an individual identifies himself/herself with the object of the organization in which he works." Ceylan (2020) complements this by viewing commitment as the allocation of one's time and interest through responsibility toward personal wishes, beliefs, or organizational affiliation.

These scholarly definitions converge on three central features: (1) emotional attachment to the organization, (2) self-identification with the organization's values and mission, and (3) the dedication of time, energy, and interest. In other words, commitment is not purely external or contractual; it is deeply internal, drawing from the psychological and affective bonds that individuals develop with their organizations.

Meyer and Allen (1991) provide a particularly influential definition, describing commitment as "a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization." Their framework underscores the affective dimension of commitment, aligning with earlier work by Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974), who defined organizational commitment as "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (p. 604). Together, these perspectives affirm that organizational commitment cannot be reduced to external behavior alone; it is fundamentally shaped by psychological identification and emotional connection.

This idea is echoed in more recent works. Idris and Manganaro (2017) describe organizational commitment as "the extent to which individuals psychologically identify with their work organization," reaffirming the role of psychological contracts in sustaining loyalty and performance. This aligns with the classic view of Porter and Lawer (1965), as cited by Herrera and Heras-Rosas (2021), which emphasized that organizational commitment stems from employees' willingness to exert effort for the benefit of the institution, coupled with loyalty to its objectives and values. Greenberg and Baron (2008) expand on this, viewing commitment as both identification with the organization and the degree of dedication shown by employees toward its success.

At the heart of these perspectives lies the concept of the psychological contract. Rousseau (1995) explains this as a set of individual beliefs about the reciprocal obligations and benefits in an exchange relationship between employees and organizations. Such contracts may take the form of relational agreements, which are driven by loyalty and expectations of long-term rewards such as promotion or job security (MacNeil, 1985). Alternatively, they may be transactional, where the exchange is largely economic—employees remain as long as salary and benefits meet expectations. Both relational and transactional contracts reflect different ways in which commitment manifests, yet both highlight the role of mutual expectations in shaping workplace relationships.

The impact of organizational commitment on individual behavior has been consistently documented in research. Fischer and Mansell (2009), Mathieu and Zajac (1990), Meyer et al. (2002), and Solinger et al. (2008) collectively found that organizational commitment strongly correlates with occupational commitment, job satisfaction, and job involvement. Employees with higher levels of commitment are less likely to leave their organizations, exhibit lower absenteeism, and demonstrate organizational citizenship behaviors such as going beyond their formal roles. Earlier studies by Angle and Perry (1981) and subsequent works reaffirm that organizational commitment not only supports retention but also contributes to overall well-being and engagement at work.

In sum, organizational commitment is best understood not simply as the willingness to devote time and energy but as a psychological contract between the employee and the institution. This contract—whether relational or transactional—conditions behavior, strengthens loyalty, and influences performance. Above all, it demonstrates that commitment is both practical and deeply human: employees stay not only because of obligations or rewards, but also because they feel connected, valued, and aligned with the mission of the organization.

Dimensions of organizational commitment: Affective, continuance, and normative commitment

Scholars widely agree that organizational commitment is not a singular concept but a multidimensional construct. It encompasses various attitudes, behaviors, and motivational elements that together describe an individual's relationship with an organization. Morrow (1993) emphasized two fundamental dimensions: attitude and behavior. Attitude refers to an individual's evaluative judgment toward the organization, whether positive or negative, and reflects feelings of attachment,

identification, and loyalty (Miller, 2003; Morrow, 1993). Meyer, Allen, and Gellatly (1990) further support this view, suggesting that attitude is both cognitive and affective, representing an employee's positive judgment of their organization. Attitudes, in turn, are expressed through behavior, as Ajzen (1993) noted, since internal thoughts and evaluations naturally influence outward actions.

Organizational commitment is also visible in employees' behaviors. Best (1994) highlighted that commitment manifests through active participation in assigned tasks, while Reicher (1985) argued that it is demonstrated when employees remain dedicated to the collective goals of their organization. O'Reilly (1989) described organizational commitment as a psychological bond, reflected in job involvement, loyalty, and alignment with organizational values. This bond is further evidenced by employees' acceptance of organizational goals and their willingness to exert effort on behalf of the institution (Miller & Lee, 2001).

Building upon these foundational concepts, scholars have proposed multidimensional models of organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen (1997) identified three primary dimensions: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Affective commitment reflects an employee's emotional attachment to the organization. Employees develop this attachment when their personal values and priorities align with the organization's mission and goals (Lowry, 1973). High affective commitment is linked to sustained engagement and proactive effort, as evidenced in studies by Johnson and Chang (2006), Becker et al. (1996), and Meyer et al. (2004). These studies indicate that affective commitment enhances intrinsic motivation and strengthens employees' personal desire to remain loyal to the organization.

Continuance commitment, on the other hand, is driven by a rational assessment of costs and benefits. Employees weigh the advantages of staying against the potential losses associated with leaving the organization, including personal investments and limited alternative opportunities (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Becker, 1960; Meyer & Allen, 1984). In this case, loyalty is maintained because employees perceive greater benefits in continuing their employment relationship than in terminating it.

The third dimension, normative commitment, involves a sense of moral and legal obligation to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Employees with high normative commitment remain loyal because they perceive it as the ethically or contractually correct course of action. Muhammad, Afridi, Ali, Shah, and Alasan (2021) noted that normative commitment is influenced by the belief that it is morally right to honor the employment relationship, often reinforced by formal contracts or implicit social norms.

Other scholars have proposed complementary models that map closely to Meyer and Allen's framework. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) identified three dimensions: compliance, identification, and internalization. Identification and internalization correspond to affective commitment, reflecting emotional attachment and a sense of belonging. Compliance, which refers to maintaining a relationship based on extrinsic rewards, aligns with continuance commitment.

Similarly, Balfour and Wechsler (1996) proposed identification, affiliation, and exchange as three dimensions, with identification and affiliation capturing affective aspects and exchange reflecting continuance commitment through recognition of contributions and benefits.

Overall, these various models converge conceptually, reinforcing the validity of Meyer and Allen's (1997) three-dimensional framework. Consequently, the present study adopts affective, continuance, and normative commitment as the guiding dimensions for investigating organizational commitment. This framework provides a comprehensive lens for understanding employees' emotional attachment, cost-benefit considerations, and sense of obligation toward their organization.

Organizational citizenship behavior

The concept of organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) finds its roots in political philosophy, where the notion of "citizenship" is foundational. Graham (1991) explains that the term originates from political theory and related disciplines, drawing on the works of Cary (1977) and Inkeles (1969). Citizenship, in this context, represents the responsibilities of a citizen, which Aristotle (1941) categorized into three key elements: obedience, loyalty, and political participation. Obedience entails respecting societal structures and established processes. Loyalty extends beyond mere compliance, requiring citizens

to prioritize the collective interests of the state and contribute voluntarily to its welfare, including protecting its reputation and cooperating with others to achieve shared goals. Participation, meanwhile, reflects active engagement in governance, encompassing both adherence to laws and contributions to reform, ensuring the system evolves to meet new societal demands (Graham, 1991).

This philosophical framework was adapted to organizational settings, leading scholars to conceptualize organizational citizenship behaviour as the workplace equivalent of civic responsibilities. Inkeles (1969) identified three corresponding organizational responsibilities: organizational obedience, loyalty, and participation. Organizational obedience involves adherence to company structures, policies, and role expectations, exemplified by punctuality, responsible use of resources, and respect for the chain of command. Organizational loyalty emphasizes identification with the organization and its leadership, promoting collaboration, defending the organization's reputation, and prioritizing collective over individual interests. Organizational participation encourages active involvement in governance and decision-making beyond formal requirements, including attending optional meetings, sharing insights, and supporting constructive dialogue to counteract groupthink (Inkeles, 1969).

Early researchers of OCB, including Bateman and Organ (1983) and Smith, Organ, and Near (1983), further refined these ideas, defining organizational citizenship behaviour as discretionary actions that exceed formal job requirements and benefit the organization. These behaviors align with the philosophical concepts of obedience, loyalty, and participation, reflecting employees' compliance with organizational rules, voluntary contribution to collective goals, and active engagement in non-mandatory tasks. Katz (1964), as cited by Smith et al. (1983), emphasized three essential behaviors for organizational functioning: remaining in the system, fulfilling role responsibilities reliably, and engaging in spontaneous, innovative activities beyond formal expectations. Similarly, Roethlisberger and Dickson (1964) highlighted cooperation as critical to organizational equilibrium, emphasizing prosocial behaviors that emerge from informal networks and mutual goodwill (Smith et al., 1983).

Over time, researchers sought to standardize the dimensions of OCB, with later efforts emphasizing loyalty and participation as central, rather than obedience, following recommendations from political philosophy (Graham, 1991; Inkeles, 1969). Organ and Ryan (1995) described OCB as positive work behaviors that surpass formal duties, reflecting dedication to the organization. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) and Bateman and Organ (1983) identified altruism and general compliance as core dimensions. Organ (1988) and Wang et al. (2013), as cited by Abun et al. (2021), proposed five dimensions: conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism. Sportsmanship refers to maintaining a positive attitude despite challenges; conscientiousness involves attentiveness to organizational and colleagues' needs; civic virtue encompasses active participation in organizational matters; courtesy emphasizes politeness and consideration; and altruism reflects prioritizing others' needs and providing voluntary assistance (Organ, 1988; Wang et al., 2013, cited by Abun et al., 2021).

Podsakoff et al. (2000) further expanded the framework to seven dimensions: helping behaviors, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development. Despite this proliferation of dimensions, Spector and Fox (2002) synthesized the literature, suggesting that altruistic behavior effectively encompasses all OCB dimensions. Altruistic behavior extends beyond helping others, incorporating actions that support the organization as a whole. This conceptualization consolidates the contributions of earlier scholars, including Organ (1988) and Podsakoff et al. (2000), into a comprehensive understanding of organizational citizenship behaviour as both prosocial and organization-focused discretionary action.

Statement of the problems

The study examined the interplay of employee treatment, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. It specifically answered the following questions:

1. **What is the employee treatment in terms of:**
   a. Workers' rights

b. Respect in the workplace

c. Workplace relationship

2. What is the organizational commitment of employees in terms of:

a. Affective commitment

b. Continuance commitment

c. Normative commitment

3. What is the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees in terms of:

a. OCBP

b. OCBO

4. Is there a relationship between employee treatment and organizational commitment?

5. Is there a relationship between employee treatment and organizational citizenship behavior?

Hypothesis

Employees' behavior is influenced by various factors, with organizational culture being a significant determinant. Pallathadka (2020) emphasized that organizational culture shapes employees' attitudes and behaviors within an institution. A key dimension of organizational culture is employee treatment, which has been shown to influence work engagement (Abun et al., 2023). Drawing on these findings, the present study hypothesizes that employee treatment is significantly correlated with both organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Scope and delimitation of the study

The study is limited to examining employee treatment, focusing on three dimensions: workers' rights, respect in the workplace, and workplace relationships. Additionally, it investigates organizational commitment through its three elements: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. The study also considers organizational citizenship behavior as part of its scope. The population for this study is confined to the employees of Divine Word College of Laoag.

Research methodology

The study adopted a quantitative approach, employing both descriptive and correlational research designs to investigate the variables of interest. The research was conducted within the institution where the researcher is employed, which served as the study's locale. The population of the study consisted of the institution's employees.

Data were collected using structured questionnaires, which allowed for the measurement of participants' responses in a standardized manner. Both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were employed in analyzing the data. Specifically, the weighted mean was used to summarize the participants' responses, while Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was applied to examine the relationships between the variables.

Prior to data collection, a formal request for permission to conduct the study and distribute the questionnaires was submitted to the institution's President. Distribution and retrieval of questionnaires were facilitated through the employees' representatives to ensure efficiency and accessibility. Ethical considerations were observed throughout the study. However, since the research did not involve sensitive human issues or pose significant risks to participants, a full ethical review was waived.

The following ranges of values with their descriptive interpretation will be used:

Statistical Range	***Descriptive Interpretation***
4.21-5.00	*Strongly Agree/Very High*
3.41-4.20	*Agree/High*

2.61-3.40	*Somewhat Agree/Moderate*
1.81-2.60	*Disagree/Low*
1.00-1.80	*Strongly Disagree/Very Low*

Data presentation and analysis

This section presents the findings obtained from the research questionnaires. The presentation of data is organized in accordance with the study's statement of the problem. The study aims to investigate the interplay among employee treatment, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. Specifically, it answered the following research questions:

Problem1. What is the employee treatment in terms of:

a. Workers' rights
b. Respect in the workplace
c. Workplace relationship

Table 1: Employee treatment

Indicator	Mean	DI
Worker's right		
Security of tenure is followed	3.39	SWA/M
Employees feel secure when they are already employed	3.21	SWA/M
The offices are comfortable enough to work in	3.45	A/H
Employees are allowed to participate in decision-making through their representative	3.03	SWA/M
Management listens to the ideas of employees through their representative	2.90	SWA/M
Salary is given according to the rank and job grade	3.19	SWA/M
Salaries are beyond the minimum wage	3.17	SWA/M
Employees' problems are solved through due process	2.91	SWA/M
The employees' freedom of expression is protected	2.98	SWA/M
The employees are allowed to organize themselves	3.20	SWA/M
Composite Mean	**3.14**	**SWA/M**
Respect in the workplace		
I feel valued in my institution	3.45	A/H
All employees have equal access to professional development and training opportunities.	3.02	SWA/M
The management treats employees with respect.	3.23	SWA/M
The management's behavior toward the employees is appropriate and does not make fun of them employees	3.31	SWA/M
The management typically welcomes ideas from employees who have different views, opinions, and experiences from theirs	3.12	SWA/M
The management can work with employees coming from different backgrounds.	3.26	SWA/M
The management can openly discuss any concerns with the employees	3.13	SWA/M
Our employees are promoted based on their skills, abilities, and experience, regardless of gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or other unique characteristics	3.34	SWA/M
The management would forgive the honest mistakes of employees	3.40	SWA/M
Overall, our institution is a respectful place to work	3.48	A/H
Composite Mean	**3.27**	**SWA/M**
Workplace relationship		
The management provides support to employees who are overworked or experiencing difficulties.	3.10	SWA/M
The management looks after the welfare of the employees	3.18	SWA/M

The management is very considerate of employees and respects their abilities and willingness to learn	3.20	SWA/M
The management helps employees who have particular problems to overcome	3.19	SWA/M
The management respects employees' limitations and tries to help when they ask	3.17	SWA/M
People feel understood and accepted by the management	3.15	SWA/M
Employees can openly discuss and share their ideas with the management	3.12	SWA/M
The employees can talk openly to the management about their difficulties because they believe that the management will listen	3.09	SWA/M
Employees believe that if they share ideas and task-related problems, their management will listen and respond constructively	3.12	SWA/M
The management and employees trust each other as coworkers.	3.21	SWA/M
Composite Mean	**3.15**	**SWA/M**
Overall Mean	**3.19**	**SWA/M**

Source: Abun, et al. (2020).

Based on the data presented in the table, employee treatment received an overall mean rating of 3.19, indicating a moderate level of agreement, or "somewhat agree." This suggests that, in general, employee treatment is moderate—neither particularly high nor low. When examining the individual dimensions of employee treatment, all were rated at a similar moderate level: treatment of workers' rights (3.14), respect in the workplace (3.27), and workplace relationships (3.15).

Issues related to workers' rights encompass security of tenure, workplace safety, fair salaries, participation in decision-making, due process, freedom of expression, and the right to self-organization. Respect in the workplace includes recognition, equal opportunity, cooperative behavior, merit-based promotion, forgiveness for mistakes, attentive listening, and a respectful work environment. Workplace relationships refer to management's support for employees facing difficulties, consideration for employee welfare, acknowledgment of employees' abilities and willingness to learn, openness, active listening, and trust-building.

The moderate rating of employee treatment indicates that management has not fully established a work environment where employees consistently feel valued, respected, and fairly treated. This encompasses fair compensation, opportunities for professional growth, and a supportive organizational climate. Such practices are essential for enhancing employee engagement, productivity, and overall organizational performance (Abun et al., 2020, 2023; Roberts, 2014; Francis et al., 2017; Unsal & Rayfield, 2020; Nguyen et al., 2020).

Problem 2. What is the organizational commitment of employees in terms of:

a. Affective commitment
b. Continuance commitment
c. Normative commitment

Table 2: Organizational commitment

Indicators	Mean	DI
Affective commitment		
I would be thrilled to spend the rest of my career in this organization	3.38	SWA/M
I feel as if this organization's problems are my own	3.26	SWA/M
I feel like 'part of my family at this organization	3.44	A/H
I feel emotionally attached to this organization	3.38	SWA/M
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	3.51	A/H
I feel a strong sense of belonging to this organization	3.48	A/H
Composite Mean	**3.41**	**A/H**
Continuance commitment		

It would be very hard for me to leave my job at this organization right now, even if I wanted to	3.33	SWA/M
Too much of my life would be disrupted if I left my	3.25	SWA/M
Right now, staying with my job at this organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire	3.43	A/H
I believe I have too few options to consider leaving this organization	3.33	SWA/M
One of the few negative consequences of leaving my job at this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives elsewhere.	3.26	SWA/M
One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice	3.34	SWA/M
Composite Mean	**3.32**	**SWA/M**
Normative commitment		
I must remain with my organization.	3.37	SWA/M
Even if it were to my advantage, it would not be right to leave.	3.45	A/H
I would feel guilty if I left this organization now	3.31	SWA/M
This organization deserves my loyalty	3.45	A/H
I would not leave my organization right now because of my sense of obligation to it	3.52	A/H
I owe a great deal to this organization.	3.61	A/H
Composite Mean	**3.45**	**A/H**
Overall Mean	**3.39**	**SWA/M**

Source: Allen and Meyer (1997)

The data presented in the table indicate that the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) of employees received an overall mean rating of 3.39, reflecting a moderate level of agreement (somewhat agree). This suggests that employees' engagement in citizenship behaviors is moderate, neither particularly high nor low. When examining the dimensions individually, affective commitment (3.41) and normative commitment (3.45) were rated high, while continuance commitment (3.32) remained moderate.

Regarding affective commitment (3.41), employees strongly agree that they would be happy to spend their career with the institution, perceive institutional problems as their own, consider the organization part of their family, feel emotionally attached, attribute personal meaning to the institution, and experience a strong sense of belonging. High affective commitment indicates that employees feel a deep emotional attachment to the institution, align with its goals and values, and experience a sense of belonging, which can enhance engagement, productivity, and long-term retention (Grund & Titz, 2021; Dwiyanti et al., 2022; Stark et al., 2025; Robert & Vandenberghe, 2020).

In terms of continuance commitment (3.32), employees moderately agree that leaving the institution would be difficult, even if desired (3.33), due to the significant disruption it would cause (3.25). They recognize that staying is necessary (3.43), have limited alternatives (3.33), perceive potential negative consequences (3.26), and anticipate personal sacrifice if they leave (3.32). Moderate continuance commitment reflects employees' perception of the economic or practical costs of leaving, suggesting that retention is driven more by necessity and perceived losses than by positive emotional attachment to the organization (Stark et al., 2025; Erben & Guneser, 2007; Ayari & AlHamaqi, 2021; Meyer et al., 2002; Wang et al., 2022).

With respect to normative commitment (3.45), employees strongly agree that they feel obligated to remain with the institution, even when leaving may be advantageous, and experience guilt if they consider leaving. High normative commitment indicates that employees stay out of a sense of responsibility, loyalty, or gratitude, distinguishing it from affective commitment, which is motivated by desire, and continuance commitment, which is motivated by cost considerations (Ran & Zhou, 2023; Stark et al., 2025; Zhang & Xie, 2022; Sam-Mensah et al., 2025).

Problem 3. What is the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees in terms of:

a. OCBP

b. OCBO

Table 3: Organizational citizenship behavior

Indicator	Mean	DI
OCBP		
Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a work problem	3.67	A/H
Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a personal problem	3.65	A/H
Change vacation schedules, workdays, or shifts to accommodate coworkers' needs	3.61	A/H
Help a less capable coworker lift a heavy box or other objects	3.64	A/H
Went out of the way to encourage coworkers or express appreciation	3.66	A/H
Defended a coworker who was being 'put down" or spoken ill of by other coworkers or supervisors	3.60	A/H
Help coworkers with personal matters, such as sharing food or drinks	3.67	A/H
Lent money or personal property to a coworker	3.71	A/H
Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a work problem	3.63	A/H
Composite Mean	**3.65**	**A/H**
OCBO		
Help new employees get oriented to the job	3.71	A/H
Offered suggestions to improve how work is done	3.75	A/H
Volunteered for extra work assignments	3.68	A/H
Said good things about your employer in front of others	3.77	A/H
Said good things about your school in the community outside the school	3.73	A/H
Give up meals and other breaks to complete the work	3.68	A/H
Offered suggestions for improving the work environment	3.75	A/H
came in early or stayed late without pay to complete a project or task	3.64	A/H
Volunteer to share new job knowledge or skills with other employees	**3.71**	**A/H**
Overall Mean	**3.68**	**A/H**

Source: Fox and Specter (2002).

The data in the table indicate that employees' organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) received an overall mean rating of 3.68, reflecting a high level of agreement (agree). This suggests that employees demonstrate a relatively strong engagement in citizenship behaviors, though not at the highest possible level. When examining the dimensions separately, both were rated high: Organizational Citizenship Behavior–Personnel (OCBP) obtained a composite mean of 3.65, whereas Organizational Citizenship Behavior–Organization (OCBO) attained a composite mean of 3.71.

In terms of OCBP (3.65), employees highly agreed that they lent a compassionate ear when colleagues encountered work-related problems (3.67) or personal difficulties (3.65), engaged in self-sacrifice to assist colleagues in need (3.61), helped less capable employees handle heavy tasks (3.64), encouraged and expressed appreciation toward coworkers (3.66), defended colleagues when criticized (3.60), and lent money to colleagues in need (3.71). High OCBP reflects employees' voluntary efforts to go beyond formal job responsibilities, supporting colleagues through discretionary behaviors such as providing guidance, offering assistance, and sharing knowledge without expectation of formal recognition (Wilhem et al., 2022; Spanouli et al., 2023; Lilly, 2018; Zhang et al., 2011; Yu et al., 2018).

Regarding OCBO (3.71), employees strongly agreed that they helped orient new employees (3.71), suggested improvements to job processes (3.75), volunteered for additional assignments (3.68), spoke positively about the employer in front of others (3.77), promoted the institution to outsiders (3.73), offered assistance to improve the work environment (3.75), arrived early and stayed late to complete tasks (3.64), and voluntarily shared new knowledge and skills with colleagues (3.71). High OCBO demonstrates employees' proactive engagement in behaviors that advance the organization's goals, including volunteering for extra work, promoting the organization, and supporting colleagues beyond assigned duties. Such behaviors contribute positively to organizational effectiveness, employee productivity, and overall well-being (Hazzi, 2018; Lilly, 2018; Lilly, 2023; Zhang et al., 2011; Jankelova et al., 2024).

Problem 4. Is there a relationship between employee treatment and organizational commitment?

Table 4: Relationship between employee treatment and organizational commitment

		Affective commitment	Continuance commitment	Normative commitment	Organizational commitment
workers' rights	Pearson Correlation	.023	.048	-.093	-.005
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.767	.539	.236	.952
respect in the workplace	Pearson Correlation	.064	.042	.015	.058
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.418	.593	.845	.459
workplace relationship	Pearson Correlation	.058	.026	-.026	.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.459	.743	.740	.716
employee treatment	Pearson Correlation	.060	.048	-.043	.034
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.447	.539	.582	.667

Source: SPSS

The results of the Pearson correlation analysis indicate that there is no statistically significant relationship between employee treatment and the various dimensions of organizational commitment—affective, continuance, and normative—as well as overall organizational commitment. Specifically, the correlation coefficients between employee treatment and affective commitment (r = .060, p = .447), continuance commitment (r = .048, p = .539), normative commitment (r = –.043, p = .582), and overall organizational commitment (r = .034, p = .667) were low in magnitude and did not reach statistical significance at the 0.05 level. These findings suggest that differences in employee treatment, as measured in this study, do not correspond to changes in employees' levels of organizational commitment.

A similar trend emerged when examining employee treatment through its subcomponents: workers' rights, respect in the workplace, and workplace relationships. None of these individual dimensions demonstrated significant correlations with any organizational commitment components. For instance, respect in the workplace exhibited minimal correlations with affective commitment (r = .064, p = .418), continuance commitment (r = .042, p = .593), normative commitment (r = .015, p = .845), and overall organizational commitment (r = .058, p = .459). Likewise, workers' rights and workplace relationships produced negligible correlation coefficients, ranging from –0.026 to 0.05, with corresponding p-values exceeding 0.05. Collectively, these results reinforce the conclusion that, within this study, employee treatment does not have a meaningful association with employees' organizational commitment.

Problem 5. Is there a relationship between employee treatment and organizational citizenship behavior?

Table 5: Relationship between employee treatment and organizational citizenship behavior

		OCBP	OCBO	Organizational citizenship behavior
workers' rights	Pearson Correlation	-.023	-.053	-.041
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.766	.501	.608
respect in the workplace	Pearson Correlation	-.083	-.098	-.094
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.295	.215	.232
workplace relationship	Pearson Correlation	.081	.017	.050
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.307	.826	.524
Employee treatment	Pearson Correlation	-.012	-.057	-.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.878	.473	.643

Source: SPSS

The correlation analysis revealed no statistically significant relationship between employee treatment and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) across its dimensions—OCB directed toward individuals (OCBP), OCB directed toward the organization (OCBO), and overall OCB. The correlation coefficients between employee treatment and OCBP (r = –.012, p =

.878), OCBO (r = –.057, p = .473), and overall OCB (r = –.037, p = .643) were negligible in magnitude. None reached the conventional threshold for statistical significance ($p < 0.05$). These results indicate that variations in perceived employee treatment do not correspond with differences in the frequency or quality of discretionary behaviors that benefit colleagues or the organization.

A closer examination of the components of employee treatment—workers' rights, respect in the workplace, and workplace relationships—yields a similar conclusion. Workers' rights exhibited negligible and non-significant correlations with OCBP (r = –.023, p = .766), OCBO (r = –.053, p = .501), and overall OCB (r = –.041, p = .608). Respect in the workplace also demonstrated weak negative correlations with all OCB dimensions, while workplace relationships yielded weak and inconsistent associations (e.g., r = .081 with OCBP, p = .307; r = .017 with OCBO, p = .826). These uniformly low coefficients suggest that the interpersonal and organizational aspects of treatment assessed in this study are not salient predictors of citizenship behaviors.

Results and discussion

The study aimed to assess employee treatment, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior, and to examine the effect of employee treatment on these behaviors. Results show that employee treatment and organizational commitment were rated moderate, while organizational citizenship behavior was rated high. However, the correlation analysis suggests that neither the moderate nor the high level of organizational commitment rating was associated with the employee treatment. The moderate and high ratings for organizational commitment and citizenship may be attributed to other organizational factors not covered in the study. These results contradict the previous finding related to the effect of employee treatment on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, like that of Stark, et al. (2025), Belwal & Belwal, 2023), Nguyen (2023), but support the study of Moorman, et al. (1993) and Abun, et al. (2024)

The results have several implications, including management and theoretical implications. Management implications as a result of no relationship between employee treatment and organizational commitment indicates that organization may need to reassess their HR strategies, focusing on the factors that drive commitment such as job satisfaction, organizational culture or leadership (Nguyen, 2023; Ismail & Razak, 2016, Li, et al. 2008, Sarhan, et al., 2019). Resources spent on employee treatment initiatives might be redirected to other areas like compensation, benefits, or professional development that could bring a greater impact on commitment (Rehman, 2017; Grund & Titz, 2021). Organizations might also explore alternative strategies to boost commitment, such as recognition programs, career growth opportunities, or flexible work arrangements. On theoretical implications, the results of the study might challenge the existing theories like social exchange theories of Homans, which posits that favorable treatment might lead to reciprocal commitment (Ahmad, et al., 2023; Cook, et al., 2013; Rajaa & Mekkaoui, 2025). The lack of relationship highlights the importance of contextual factors that influence the treatment-commitment link, suggesting the need for more nuanced research. Research might also include moderating variables, such as job autonomy and leadership style, that could explain why treatment does not directly impact commitment.

The lack of a relationship between employee treatment and organizational citizenship behavior has several management and theoretical implications. Concerning management implications, the study's results suggest shifting the focus to other factors that drive OCB, such as job satisfaction or leadership style, rather than solely on treatment (Gupta et al., 2023; Saxena et al., 2019; Fitrio et al., 2029). Managers might explore other alternative strategies to encourage OCB, like recognition and wards specifically for discretionary behaviors (Yang et al., 2022; Jo & Shin, 2025; Zhao et al., 2022). The results suggest reassessing their investment in employee treatment initiatives, considering whether these initiatives are yielding desired outcomes in terms of OCB. Theoretically, the study's results challenge the assumption of social exchange theory, which suggests that favorable treatment translates into positive outcomes or reciprocal behaviors like OCB. Further, the results highlight the importance of contextual factors like organizational culture or work environment that influence the treatment-OCB link (Jianmin, 2025; Patki & Abhyankar, 2024; Reio & Reio, 2011; Arumi et al., 2019)

The results of the current study recommend further study to include more variables or factors that influence organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Contextual factors should be considered that might significantly influence organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Conclusion

The study sought to evaluate employee treatment, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior, as well as to determine whether employee treatment significantly affects these organizational outcomes. Findings revealed that employees perceived their treatment and organizational commitment at a moderate level, whereas organizational citizenship behavior was rated high.

Despite these ratings, correlation analysis demonstrated no significant relationship between employee treatment and organizational commitment or organizational citizenship behavior. This suggests that the observed levels of commitment and citizenship behavior are not directly influenced by employee treatment alone. Other factors, whether organizational or individual, may play a more substantial role in shaping these employee behaviors. Accordingly, the study's hypothesis regarding the impact of employee treatment is not supported.

These results underscore the importance of exploring additional factors that could strengthen organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. Variables such as job satisfaction, organizational culture, leadership style, or employee engagement may provide deeper insights into what drives employees' attachment to the organization and their willingness to engage in discretionary behaviors that benefit colleagues and the institution.

Authors' contribution: Conceptualization: D.A., E.B.N., E.B.V. **Data gathering**: ……..**Data Analysis**: D.A.,E.B. N., E.B.V.

Ethical statement: the study ensured no violation of ethical standards during the conduct of the study

Funding: The study was funded by the authors.
Conflict of interest statement: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Abun, D., Ranay, F.B., Magallanes, T., Encarnacion, M.J. & Alkalde, F. (2020). Employee treatment and work engagement: The Philippines context. *Proteus Journal, 11*(10).

Abun, D., Ubasa, A.L.A., Magallanes, T., Encarnacion, M.J. & Ranay, F.B. (2021). Attitude toward the work and its influence on the Individual work performance of employees: Basis for Attitude Management. *Technium Social Science Journal, 18*, 378-394.

Abun, D., Ranay, F. B., Reyes, J.B. & Menor, R. I. (2023). The Effect of Treatment of Employees on the Level of Work Engagement: School Context (March 10, 2023). *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities 2*(1), 148-165. https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v2i1.17

Abun, D., Ubasa, A.L. Menor, R. & Mateo, L.J. (2024). Investigating the impact of employee treatment on commitment and citizenship behavior of employees: Sorting the effect of workers' rights, respect in the workplace, and workplace relationships. *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities, 3*(4), 1069-1094. https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v3i4.110

Ajzen, I. (1993). *Attitude Theory and the Attitude-Behavior Relation*. In D. Krebs & P. Schidt (Eds.). *New directions in attitude measurement (*pp. 41-57). Walter de Gruyter

Ahmad, R., Nawaz, M. R., Ishaq, M. I., Khan, M. M., & Ashraf, H. A. (2023). Social exchange theory: Systematic review and future directions. *Frontiers in psychology*, *13*, 1015921. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1015921

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The Measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x

Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392596

Aristotle. (1941). *Politics* (B. Jowett, Trans.). In R. McKeon (Ed.). *The basic works of Aristotle*, *1114-1316*. Random House.

Arumi, M. S., Aldrin, N., & Murti, T. R. (2019). Effect of organizational culture on organizational citizenship behavior with organizational commitment as a mediator. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478)*, *8*(4), 124–132. https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v8i4.274

Ayari, A., & AlHamaqi, A. (2021). Investigation of organizational commitment and turnover intention: A Study of the Bahraini Oil and Gas Industry. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 34*, 123–138. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-021-09382-2

Balfour, D. L., & Wechsler, B. (1996). Organizational commitment: antecedents and outcomes in public Organizations. *Public Productivity & Management Review, 19*(3), 256–277. https://doi.org/10.2307/3380574

Baofo, I.M. (2018). The effect of workplace respect and violence on nurses' job satisfaction in ghana: A cross-sectional Survey. *Human Resource for Health, 16*(6). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-018-0269-9

Barsade, S. & O'Neill, O.A. (2014). Employees who feel love perform better. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2014/01/employees-who-feel-love-perform-better

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and 'citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*(4), 587-595. https://doi.org/10.2307/255908

Becker, H.S. (1960). Notes on the Concept of Commitment. *American Journal of Sociology, 66,* 32-42. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/222820

Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilbert, N. L. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*, 464–482. https://doi.org/10.2307/256788

Belwal, S., & Belwal, R. (2023). Work-family conflict and women's turnover intention: Mediating effects of organizational commitment. *Applied Research Quality Life, 18*, 1915–1937. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-023-10168-x

Best, P.W. (1994). Locus of control, personal commitment, and commitment to the organisation. *Unpublished MCom thesis. University of South Africa, Pretoria*

Brenner, A. (2014). The abcs of caring relationship. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from https://www.psychologytoday.com/

Brooks, J.D. (2018). Just a little respect: Differences in job satisfaction among individuals with and without disabilities. *Wiley Online Library*. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12543.

Burton, n. (2015). Empathy versus sympathy. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from https://www.psychologytoday.com/

Busto, A.V. (2013). *The Philippine Labor Code*. A.V.B. Printing Press.

Caritas Australia (n.d). *The dignity of the human person*. Retrieved February 11, 2024, from https://www.caritas.org.au/

Cary, C. D. (1977). The goals of citizenship training in American and Soviet schools. *Studies in Comparative Communism,* 10(3), 281-297.

Ceylan, C. (2020). Management by values in educational organizations: A case study of a Technical University. *IGI Global: Publisher Timely Knowledge*. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-2562-3.ch005.

Choi, S. (2011). Organizational justice and employee work attitudes: The federal case. *American Review of Public Administration, 41,* 185-204. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010373

Calayag, K.A. (2018). House approves security of tenure bill. *Sun Star Philippines*. https://www.sunstar.com.ph/article/416435.

Cambridge Dictionary (n.d). Age. In *the Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved March 5, 2024, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/

Cochrane, A. (n.d). Environmental ethics. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved March 10, 2024, from https://www.iep.utm.edu/envi-eth/

Cook, K.S., Ceshire, C., Rice, E. & Nakagawa, S. (2013). Social exchange theory. In *Handbook of Social Psychology.* Springer

Cooley, S. (2016). *Human Relations theory of organizations. In: Farazmand, A. (eds) Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_2998-1

Development and Peace (2000). *The dignity of the human person*. Retrieved February 9, 2024, from https://www.devp.org/sites/www.devp.org/files/documents/materials/devpeace_cst_principles.pdf

Dillon, R.S. (2018). Respect. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved February 10, 2024, from https://plato.stanford.edu/.

Dwiyanti, R., Rozana, M., Na'imah, T. & Rafiyana, G.A. (2022). Turnover intentions of teachers in Indonesia: The role of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. *Social Values and Society, 4*(2).

Edery, R.A. (2017). The influence of organizational respect on job satisfaction in the human services: Findings from a New York State multi-site job satisfaction cross-sectional survey – a short commentary. *International Journal of Emergency Mental Health and Human Resilience, 19*(3), 1-2. https://doi.org/10.4172/1522-4821.1000368

Eldor, L. & Shoshani, A. (2016). Caring relationship in school staff: exploring the link between compassion and teacher work engagement. *Teacher and Teaching Education, 59*, 126-136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.06.001

Erben, G.S., & Güneşer, A. (2007). The relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment: Investigating the role of climate regarding ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics 82*, 955–968. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9605-z

Fischer, R., & Mansell, A. (2009). Commitment across cultures: A meta-analytic approach. *Journal of International Business Studies, 40* (8), 1339-1358. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27752450. https://doi.org/ 10.1057/jibs 2009.14

Fitrio, T., Apryansah, R., Utami, S. & Yaspita, H. (2019). The effect of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) mediated by organizational commitment. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management, 7*(09). https://doi.org/ 10.18535/ijsrm/v7i9.em01

Francis, B., Hasan, I., & Liu, L (2017). Employee treatment and contracting with bank lenders: An instrumental approach for stakeholder management. *Journal of Business Ethics, 158,* 1029–1046 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3722-0

Fridan, A.A.A. & Maamari, B.E. (2023). Impact of organizational positive and negative culture on employee performance. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-05-2023-3778

Ghaffari, S. & Burgoyne, J. (2017). The influence of respect for employees on the relationship between participative leadership and job satisfaction: A case study at the Technology University of Malaysia. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 11* (4), 17-28.

GOVPH (1987). The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines – Article XIII. *Official Gazette.* https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph

Graham, J.W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 4*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01385031

Greenberg, J. & Baron, R.A. (2008). *Behavior in Organizations*. Pearson, Hoboken, 269-274.

Grund, C., & Titz, K. (2021). Affective commitment through further training: the roles of firm provision and employee participation. *Review of Managerial Science, 16,* 1195–1226. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-021-00460-1

Gupta, A., Chadha, A., & Tiwari, V. (2023). Sustainable training practices: predicting job satisfaction and employee behavior using machine learning techniques. *Asian Business and Management, 22*, 1913–1936. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41291-023-00234-5

Gurchiek, K. (2016). Survey: Respect at work boosts job satisfaction. *SHRM*. Retrieved March 2, 2025, from https://www.shrm.org

Hassan, S. (2012). Does fair treatment in the workplace matter? An assessment of organizational fairness and employee outcome in government. *The American Review of Public Administration, XX (X),* 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074012447979

Hazzi, O.A. (2018). Organizational citizenship behavior: A holistic review. In: Farazmand, A. (eds) *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3677-1

Herrera, J. & Heras-Rosas, C. (2021). The organizational commitment in the company and its relationship with the psychological contract. *Frontier in Psychology, 11*, 609211. https://doi.org/ 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.609211

Hodson, R. (2004). Work-life and social fulfilment: Does social affiliation at work reflect a carrot or a stick? *Social Science Quarterly 85*(2), 221–239. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0038-4941.2004.08502001.x

Houston, E. (2020). The importance of positive relationships in the workplace. *Positive Psychology*. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from https://positivepsychology.com/positive-relationships-workplace/

Idris, A. M., & Manganaro, M. (2017*).* Relationships between psychological capital, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the Saudi oil and petrochemical industries. *Journal of Human Behaviour in the Social Environment, 27*, 251–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2017.1279098.

Imamoglu, S.Z., Ince, H., Turkcan, H. & Atakay, B. (2019). The effect of organizational justice and organizational commitment on knowledge sharing and firm performance. *Procedia Computer Science, 158,* 899-906. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.09.129**

lnkeles, A. (1969). Participants' citizenship in six developing countries. *American Political Science Review, 63*(4), 1120-1141. https://doi.org/10.2307/1955075

ISMAIL, A. & RAZAK, M.R.A. (2016). Effect of job satisfaction on organizational commitment. *Management and Marketing Journal, University of Craiova, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, 0*(1), 25-40.

Jankelová, N., Némethová, I., & Dabić, M .(2024). Enhancing organizational citizenship behavior towards the environment. *Review of Managerial Science,19,* 899–930. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-024-00781-x

Jianmin, S. (2024). Organizational citizenship behavior. In: Kan, Z. (eds) *The ECPH Encyclopedia of Psychology.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-7874-4_1313

Jimenez, R.T. (2002). *Practical Guidelines in Employee Relations*. Ramon T. Jimenez Publishing.

Jimenez, J.B. (n.d). *The Philippine Labor Relations Laws and Jurisprudence*. Ramon T. Jimenez Publishing.

Jo, H., & Shin, D. (2025). The impact of recognition, fairness, and leadership on employee outcomes: A large-scale multi-group analysis. *PloS one*, *20*(1), e0312951. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0312951

Johnson, R. (2016). Kant's Moral Philosophy. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved February 15, 2024, from https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/#DutResForMorLaw.

Johnson, R.E. & Chang, C.H. (2006). "I" is to Continuance as "We" is too affective: The relevance of the self-concepts for organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27,* 549-570. https://doi.org/ 10.1002/job.364

Katz, D. (1969). The motivational basis of organizational behaviour. *Behavioral Science*, *9*, 131-133. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830090206

Kim, S.E. & Rubianty, D. (2011). Perceived fairness of performance appraisals in federal government: Does it matter? *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 31*, 329-348. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X11428903

Leonard, A.C. (2009). Alignment with sound relationships and SLA support. *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Second Edition*. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-60566-026-4.

Li, W., Shi, K., & He, D. (2008). Effects of job satisfaction, affective commitment, and job involvement on job skill ratings. *Frontier of Business Research in China, 2*, 137–154. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11782-008-0008-5

Lilly, J.D. (2018). Organizational citizenship behavior. In: Farazmand, A. (eds) Global *Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20928-9_125

Lilly, J.D. (2023). Organizational citizenship behavior. In: Farazmand, A. (eds) *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66252-3_125

Lind, E.A. & Tyler, T.R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. Plenum Press.

Lowry R. J. (1973). *AH Maslow: An Intellectual Portrait*. Brooks/Cole

Macneil, I.R. (1985). Relational contract: What we do and do not know. *Wisconsin Law Review 1*, 483-52

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents' correlation and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 171-194. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.171

Mental Health Foundation (2016). *Relationship in the 21st Century*. Mental Health Foundation.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the 'side-bet theory' of organizational commitment: some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 372–378. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.3.372

Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. & Gellatly, I.R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 710–720. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.6.710

Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1991). A Three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61-89. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z

Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace.* Sage

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the agency: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(1), 20-52. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842

Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 991–1007. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.991

Miller, K. (2003). Values, attitudes, and job satisfaction in Robbins, S.P., Odendaal, A., & Roodt, G. (eds). *Organizational behavior: Global and southern African perspectives*. Pearson Education South Africa

Miller, D. & Lee, J. (2001). The people make the process: Commitment to employees, decision making, and performance. *Journal of Management, 27*, 163–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(00)00094-5

Moorman, R.H., Niehoff, B.P. & Organ, D.W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6*, 209–225. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01419445

Morrow, P.C. (1993). *The Theory and Measurement of Work Commitment*. Jai.

Moynihan, D.P., and S.K. Pandey (2008). The ties that bind: Social networks, person-organization value fit, and turnover intention. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*(2), 205–227. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum013

Muhammad, S., Afridi, F. K., Ali, M. W., Shah, W. U., & Alasan, I. I. (2021). Effect of training on employee commitment: Mediating role of job satisfaction. *Pakistan Journal of Society, Education and Language (PJSEL), 7*(1), 28-37.

Nguyen, T., Suardi, S. & Zhao, J. (2020). Employee treatment and bank default risk during the credit crisis. *Journal of Financial Service Research, 59,* 173–208. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10693-020-00343-8

Nguyen, S.H. (2023). The impact of job satisfaction on organizational commitment: An empirical study in Vietnam. In: Nguyen, A.T., Pham, T.T., Song, J., Lin, YL., Dong, M.C. (eds) *Contemporary economic issues in Asian countries: Proceedings of CEIAC 2022*, 1. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-9669-6_12

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring, a feminine approach to ethics & moral education*. The University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (2002). *Starting at home: Caring and social policy*. The University of California Press

O'Reilly, C. (1989). Corporations, culture and commitment. *California Management Review, 31*, 9–24.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 492-499. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.492

Organ, D.W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up Time. *Human Performance*, *10*(2), 85-97.

Organ, D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995*).* A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*, 4, 775-803. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x

Pallathadka, H. (2020). Influence of organizational culture on employee behavior. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine, 7(10)*.

Patki, S.M. & Abhyankar, S.C. (2024). *Organizational citizenship behavior in India*. Springer.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, *26*, 513–563. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307

Podsakoff, P.M. & MacKenzie, S.B. (1997) Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 133-151. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_5

Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*(5), 603–609. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0037335

Praveena, A. & Fronceca, C.M. (2023). Organizational culture and its influence on employee behavior. *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research, 14*(4), 2945-2949. https://doi.org/ 10.24327/ijrsr.2024.1404.0605

Porter, L. W., & Lawer, E. E. (1965). *Managerial Attitudes and Performance.* Homewood.

Putri, N.E., Nimran, U., Raharjo, K. & Wilopo, W. (2021). The impact of organizational culture on employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 570*

Rajâa, O., & Mekkaoui, A. (2025). Revealing the impact of social exchange theory on financial performance: a systematic review of the mediating role of human resource performance. *Cogent Business & Management*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2475983

Ran, Y., & Zhou, H. (2023). High-commitment work systems, organizational psychological ownership, and unethical pro-organizational behavior: a nonlinear mediation model. *Current Psychology, 43*, 11526–11537. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05409-z

Regan, T. (2004). *The case for animal rights, 2nd ed.* The University of California Press

Rehman, S. (2017). Impact of career development on organizational commitment. *International Journal of Business and Administrative Studies, 3*(3), 100-111.

Reicher, A.E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review, 10,* 465–476. https://doi.org/10.2307/258128

Reio, T. G., & Sanders-Reio, J. (2011). Thinking about workplace engagement: Does supervisor and coworker incivility matter? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *13*(4), 462-478. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422311430784

Republic of the Philippines (1953). An act to promote industrial peace and for other purposes (Repealed by Presidential Decree, No. 442). *The LAWPHIL Project: Arellano Law Foundation*. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1953/ra_875_1953.html.

Roberts, G.E. (2014). Employee fair treatment principles. In: *Servant Leader Human Resource Management.* Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137428370_5

Robert, V., & Vandenberghe, C. (2020). Laissez-faire leadership and affective commitment: the roles of leader-member exchange and subordinate relational self-concept. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 36*, 533–551. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09700-9

Roethlisberger, F.J., & Dickson, W. J (1964). Management and the worker. *Wiley Science Editions*

Rosanne, R. (2014). It's All About Relationships. *Nursing Management, 46*(11), 6.

Ross, A. (2009). What is the 'force' of moral law in Kant's practical philosophy? *Parallax,15* (2), 27 — 40. https://doi.org/10.1080/13534640902792994

Rousseau, D. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations, understanding written and unwritten agreements.* Sage.

Rubin, E.V. (2011). Exploring the links between procedural fairness and union membership in Federal Government. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 31*, 128-142. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/0734371X11408571

Sam-Mensah, R., Bingab, B.B.B., & Boakye, K.O. (2025). Safety first, retention forever: enhancing commitment and reducing turnover through safety practices. *Future Business Journal, 11*(52). https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-025-00475-0

Sarhan, N., Harb, A., Shrafat, F. & Alhusban, M. (2019). The effect of organizational culture on organizational commitment: Evidence from the hotel industry. *Management Science Letters, 10*(1). https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2019.8.004

Saxena, S., Tomar, K., & Tomar, S. (2019). Impact of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior. *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Digital Strategies for Organizational Success*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3323753 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3323753

Singer, P. (1974). All animals are equal. *Philosophical Exchange, 1*(5), 243-257.

Smith, M.K. (2020). *Nel Noddings, The ethics of care and education*. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from https://infed.org/mobi/nel-noddings-the-ethics-of-care-and-education/

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behaviour: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*(4), 653-663. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653

Solinger, O. N., van Olffen, W., & Roe, R. A. (2008). Beyond the three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(1), 70-83

Spanouli, A., Bidee, J. & Hofmans, J. (2023). Need satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour towards the organization. A process-oriented approach. *Current Psychology, 43,* 10813–10824. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05181-0

Stark, H.P., Smith, R.W. & Carter, N.T. (2025). Organizational commitment profiles and employee well-being: Exploratory and confirmatory latent profile analyses. *Occupational Health Science, 9*(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s41542-025-00225-2

Staudt, M.S. (2016). Care ethics. *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved March 1, 2024, from https://www.iep.utm.edu/care-eth/

Tran, K.T., Nguyen, P.V., Dang, T.T.U., & Ton, T.N.B. (2018). The Impact of High-Quality Workplace Relationships on Job Performance: A Perspective on Staff Nurses in Vietnam. *Behavioral Sciences, 8*(12), 109. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs8120109

Unsal, O., & Rayfield, B. (2020). Corporate governance and employee treatment: evidence from takeover defenses. *Journal of Economic and Finance, 44,* 361–391. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12197-019-09478-4

Wang, L., Hinrichs, K.T. & Prieto, L. (2013). Five dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour: Comparing antecedents and levels of engagement in China and the US. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *30*, 115-147.

Wang, CX., Guo, Y. & Duan, J. (2022). When does commitment backfire: Linking employee continuance commitment to silence behavior. *European Review of Applied Psychology,72*(6), 100797. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2022.100797.

Wilhelm, B., Simarasl, N., & Riar, F.J. (2022). Organizational citizenship behavior: understanding interaction effects of psychological ownership and agency systems. *Review of Managerial Science, 18*, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-022-00610-z

Yang, T., Jiang, X., & Cheng, H. (2022). Employee recognition, task performance, and OCB: Mediated and moderated by pride. *Sustainability*, *14*(3), 1631. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031631

Yu, K., Wang, Z. & Huang, Y. (2018). Work-family conflict and organizational citizenship behavior: the role of job satisfaction and decision authority. *Frontiers Business Research in China, 12*(17). https://doi.org/10.1186/s11782-018-0039-5

Zhang, L. f., & Xie, Z. (2022). Research agendas and organizational commitment among academics in mainland China. *Higher Education, 86*, 429–448. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00941-6

Zhang, Y., Liao, J. & Zhao, J. (2011). Research on the organizational citizenship behavior continuum and its consequences. *Frontiers Business Research in China, 5*(3), 6364-379. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11782-011-0135-2

Zhao, X., Yang, Y-c., Han, G., & Zhang, Q. (2022). The impact of positive verbal rewards on organizational citizenship behavior—The mediating role of psychological ownership and affective commitment. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 864078. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.864078

Publisher's Note: DWIJMH stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© 2025 by the authors. Licensee DWIJMH. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/)

Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities. DWIJMH is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.